

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 21	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 25-Jul-2003		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER, CARDEROCK CODE 3352 KAREN GUTMAKER 5001 SOUTH BROAD ST PHILADELPHIA PA 19112-1403		CODE N65540		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N65540-03-R-0041	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 18-Jun-2003	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>5</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A.THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B.THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C.THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D.OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) SEE PAGE TWO							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 25-Jul-2003	

EXCEPTION TO SF 30
APPROVED BY OIRM 11-84

30-105-04

STANDARD FORM 30 (Rev. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

1. The closing date and time is hereby extended to 26 August 2003 at 2:30 PM.
2. The LEVEL OF EFFORT chart on page 3 of 71 is replaced with the following to include estimates of work that may be performed at Government Office Facilities (Off-Site).

LABOR CATEGORY	YEAR 1 **ON SITE	YEAR 1 ***OFF SITE	YEAR 2 ON SITE	YEAR 2 OFF SITE	YEAR 3 ON SITE	YEAR 3 OFF SITE	YEAR 4 ON SITE	YEAR 4 OFF SITE	YEAR 5 ON SITE	YEAR 5 OFF SITE	TOTAL
Program Manager*	11,000	10,000	11,000	10,000	11,000	10,000	11,000	10,000	11,000	10,000	105,000
Project Engineer*	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	150,000
Senior Engineer*	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	100,000
Junior Engineer	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	100,000
Engineer*	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	150,000
Systems Analyst*	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	50,000
Logistician	14,000	0	14,000	0	14,000	0	14,000	0	14,000	0	70,000
Configuration Management Specialist	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	90,000
Senior Engineering Technician*	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	100,000
Junior Engineering Technician	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	100,000
Computer Science Engineer	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	150,000
Computer Programmer	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	50,000
Software Technician	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	50,000
Draftsman	15,000	0	15,000	0	15,000	0	15,000	0	15,000	0	75,000
Word Processor	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	15,000
TOTAL HOURS	152,000	119,000	152,000	119,000	152,000	119,000	152,000	119,000	152,000	119,000	1,355,000

*Denotes Key Personnel

*On-Site: Contractor's Facility and other sites

**Off-Site: Government Office Facilities

3. The following clause is hereby incorporated:

CAR-H01 PAYMENT OF FIXED-FEE UNDER COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE (COMPLETION) INDEFINITE QUANTITY CONTRACTS (APR 2001) (NSWCCD)

(a) The orders issued under this contract shall be of the cost-plus-fixed-fee completion form. Each order will describe the scope of work by stating a definite goal or target and specifying an end product that normally will take the form of a final report. This completion form provides for payment to the contractor of a negotiated fee that is fixed at the inception of the order. In as much as the orders are issued under the authority of the base contract, the fee fixed for individual orders will be distributed at the same proportional rate to the estimated cost of the order as the fixed-fee is proportional to the estimated cost in the base contract. This method of fee distribution is for administrative convenience and is not establishing the fee amount on the estimated cost of each order since the fee established in the base contract was established by use of weighted guidelines or competitive cost realism.

(b) The fixed fee does not vary with actual cost, but may be subject to an equitable adjustment as a result of changes in the work to be performed under the order. The order shall require the contractor to complete and deliver the specified end product (e.g., a final report of research accomplishing the goal or target) within the estimated cost, if possible, as a condition for payment of the entire fixed fee. However, in the event the work cannot be completed within the estimated cost, the Government may require more effort without increase in fee, provided the Government increases the estimated cost.

(c) The cost-plus-fixed-fee completion form necessarily involves uncertainties in the performance of each order, and alterations or variations made by the Contractor during performance of the order normally are not subject to an equitable adjustment in fee. Examples of such alterations or variations include a shift in emphasis among work areas or tasks, filling in details to complete the general description of work, or refinements in approaches or proposed solutions. Consequently, the Contractor will be entitled to an equitable adjustment in the fixed fee only when the Contracting Officer changes the work to be performed under an order by issuing a written order pursuant to the Changes-Cost Reimbursement clause of this contract.

(d) In addition, this contract does not allow for the application of fee on Support Cost items. Therefore, ceilings established for Support Costs shall be identified as "not-to-exceed" items and should be tracked separately. Should the estimated costs associated with the labor portion (i.e., not identified as Support Cost items) of any order be reduced, the fee shall be reduced accordingly even if there is no overall reduction in the total estimated cost of the order.

4. The following clause has been modified to change the following:

Add a 100 page maximum limitation on Technical Proposals under (2) TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

Add a 3 page maximum limitation on Resumes for key personnel under (2) TECHNICAL PROPOSAL, SECTION 2 – PERSONNEL

Change the references to section C.4 and C.7 in paragraphs (3) COST PROPOSAL (1) and (2) to section B.

Delete the Engineering Technician category under Minimum qualifications under Section 2 – PERSONNEL

Deleted "... and specific experience directly related to the task statements in the Scope of Work paragraphs 2.1.a through 2.1.v." in the sentence before the Minimum Qualifications under Section 2 – PERSONNEL.

CAR-L11 PROPOSAL PREPARATION REQUIREMENT (JUL 2002) (NSWCCD)

It is requested that offerors prepare their proposals in accordance with the following organization, content and format requirements to assist the government in making a complete and thorough evaluation of all proposals. Proposals shall be submitted as three separate documents, as follows:

Documents	Original	Copies
Solicitation, Offer and Award Document (SF-33)	1	2
Technical Proposal	1	5
Cost Proposal	1	2

The "originals" shall be clearly identified as the "ORIGINAL", and bear the original signature(s) of the offeror. The "copies" shall be complete and clearly identified as "COPY" or "DUPLICATE".

In order to facilitate the evaluation process, it is requested that offerors also submit their cost and technical proposals' spreadsheets on diskette (in addition to the hard copy requirements stated above). Diskettes shall be in 3.5 inch, high density format, and it is requested that the spreadsheet files be compatible with Windows 95 Version 4.0, Excel 97 Version 8.0. The provision of these spreadsheet files on diskette in no way relinquishes the offeror's responsibility to provide hard copies of the cost and technical proposals.

(1) SOLICITATION, OFFER AND AWARD DOCUMENTS (SF-33 RFP)

This document, which may be used as part of the contract award document, shall be fully executed and returned as a separate document from the technical and cost proposals. Special attention should be taken to accurately enter the prices required in Section B, complete all Representations and Certifications in Section K and ensure that an authorized person signs the offer in Block 17 of Page 1.

The document SHALL NOT be embellished with any cover or binding. If the offeror makes any qualifications to any provisions in the RFP, all such qualifications shall be listed in a cover letter to the proposal. Qualifications may also be annotated on the Solicitation, Offer and Award document, if such annotation is necessary to clarify the qualifications.

(2) TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

Technical proposals shall be a maximum of 100 pages in length.

The technical/management proposal should be written so that management and engineering oriented personnel can make a thorough evaluation and arrive at a sound determination as to whether the proposal meets the requirements of this solicitation. To this end, the technical proposal shall be so specific, detailed and complete as to clearly and fully demonstrate that the prospective contractor has a thorough understanding of the technical requirements contained in Section C of this solicitation.

Statements such as "the offeror understands," "will comply with the statement of work," "standard procedures will be employed," "well known techniques will be used" and general paraphrasing of the statement of work are considered inadequate. The technical proposal must provide details concerning what the contractor will do and how it will be done. This includes a full explanation of the techniques, disciplines, and procedures proposed to be followed.

ANY EXCEPTION TO THE GOVERNMENT'S TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS/SPECIFICATION MUST BE INCLUDED IN A COVER LETTER TO THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL.

Offerors are not encouraged to take exceptions to this solicitation. Any exceptions taken to the specifications, terms, and conditions of this solicitation shall be explained in detail and set forth in a cover letter as well as in the related section of the Technical Proposal. Offerors are to detail the particular section, clause, paragraph, and page to which they are taking exception.

The technical proposal shall not contain any reference to cost; however, information concerning labor allocation and categories, consultants, travel, materials, equipment and any information of interest to technical reviewers shall be contained in the technical proposal in sufficient detail so that the offeror's understanding of the scope of the work may be adequately evaluated. The technical proposal shall be page numbered, contain a table of contents, be organized in the following four (5) sections, and shall address in detail the following information:

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

This section shall provide any necessary background information and an overview of the proposal which the offeror believes will assist in the understanding and accurate evaluation of the proposal.

The factors detailed below will be evaluated by the EC.

SECTION 2 - PERSONNEL

Offerors will be required to submit resumes for key personnel. The required minimum number of key personnel resumes will be 10. One resume cannot be submitted for more than two (2) labor categories. Resumes for key personnel shall be a maximum of 3 pages. The offerors shall use the following format for written key personnel resumes:

Labor Category

Name:

Security Clearance:

Current Employer:

Education/Training: (list any diplomas and/or degrees obtained, institution, year obtained)

Summary: (provide a concise summary paragraph on why this individual was selected as key personnel)

Directly Related Work Experience: (list each relevant job title, the inclusive dates of employment (month/yr), the employer, and a brief synopsis for each job listed on how this experience is directly related to the scope of work of the acquisition under competition.)

References: (provide two (2) verifiable references from government or commercial customers with extensive knowledge of the individual on projects of similar size and scope of effort. Names, organization, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses should be provided.)

Signature/Date: (key personnel shall sign and date the resume)

Personnel will be evaluated in terms of experience, education and training as stated in the qualifications listed in the labor categories listed below.

Minimum Qualifications

The minimum qualifications for the respective labor categories are as follows.

- (a) Program Manager *: The Program Director shall have a bachelor's degree in engineering from an accredited college or university and a minimum of twenty years experience in the operation, maintenance, design, or testing of US Navy ships Hull, Mechanical, and Electrical (HM&E) equipment of which ten years must have been at the program management level. Experience with Navy maintenance strategies and Navy maintenance systems. Detailed knowledge of US Navy organizations, their functions, and their responsibilities.
- (b) Project Engineer *: The Project Engineer shall have a bachelor's degree in engineering from an accredited college or university and have a minimum of fifteen years experience in the operation,

maintenance, and in-service testing of Naval shipboard HM&E equipment. The last five years of this experience must be directly related to the SOW. Demonstrated experience managing projects similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity, as those listed in the SOW is mandatory. The educational requirements may be satisfied with an additional ten years of experience and knowledge of US Navy organizations, their functions, and their responsibility.

- (c) Senior Engineer *: The Senior Engineer shall have a bachelor's degree in engineering from an accredited college or university and a minimum of ten years experience in the design, operation, maintenance or testing of HM&E equipment. Experience in the development of technical documentation utilizing military specifications and standards. Knowledge of US Navy organizations, their functions and their responsibility. Minimum of three years supervisory experience.
- (d) Junior Engineer: The Engineer shall have a bachelor's degree in engineering from an accredited college or university and a minimum of three years experience in the design, operation, maintenance, or testing of US Naval ship's HM&E equipment. Experience in mathematical modeling of, or trending performance of shipboard equipment or systems. Experience in the development of technical documentation utilizing military standards and specifications.
- (e) Engineer*: The Engineer shall have a bachelor's degree in engineering from an accredited college or university and a minimum of six years experience in the design, operation, maintenance, or testing of US Naval ship's HM&E equipment. Experience in mathematical modeling of, or trending performance of shipboard equipment or systems. Experience in the development of technical documentation utilizing military standards and specifications.
- (f) Systems Analyst *: The System Analyst shall have a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university and a minimum of six years experience in tasks directly related to the SOW. This experience in the design, operation, maintenance, or testing of US Naval ship's HM&E equipment. Experience in mathematical modeling of, or trending performance of shipboard equipment or systems. The educational requirements may be satisfied with an additional eight years of experience directly related to the design, operation, maintenance, or testing of US Naval ship's HM&E equipment.
- (g) Logistician: The Logistician should have a high school diploma and be a graduate of military schools which have provided and in-depth knowledge of naval shipboard systems maintenance and operation. Must demonstrate five years experience in the development of Integrated Logistics Support of systems and equipment directly related to the SOW.
- (h) Configuration Management Specialist: The Configuration Management Specialist should have a high school diploma and be a graduate of military schools which have provided an in-depth knowledge of naval shipboard systems maintenance and operation. Must have five years experience with the use and development of Configuration Management Plans of systems and equipment directly related to the Statement of Work (SOW).
- (i) Senior Engineering Technician *: The Senior Engineering Technician must be a high school graduate and be a graduate of military schools which have provided an in-depth knowledge of naval shipboard systems maintenance and operation or be a graduate of a trade, industrial or correspondence school for engineering and have fifteen years of experience involving naval ships HM&E equipment. The most recent five years experience must be directly related to the design, operation, maintenance, or testing of US Naval ship's HM&E equipment.
- (j) Junior Engineering Technician: The Engineering Technician should be a graduate of high school, trade, industrial or correspondence school for engineering and have three years of practical experience involving US Navy ships HM&E equipment.
- (k) Draftsman: The Draftsman must have five years practical experience in graphic arts and a demonstrated knowledge of graphic production equipment.

- (l) Word Processor: The Word Processor shall be a high school graduate or equivalent, must have three years experience in word processing, data entry, formatting, and operation of word processing equipment, must have two years experience in use of spreadsheet software and basic database setup, and must have formalized word processing software utilization.
- (n) Computer Science Engineer: The computer science engineer should have completed a full 4-year course of study in an accredited college or university leading to a Bachelor's degree or higher in computer science engineering with 30 semester hours in a combination of mathematics, statistics, and computer science. At least 15 of the 30 semester hours must have been in any combination of statistics and mathematics that included differential and integral calculus. Computer science engineer should have six years of practical experience involving US Navy maintenance databases and systems.
- (o) Computer Programmer: The computer programmer should have completed a full 4-year course of study in an accredited college or university leading to a Bachelor's degree or higher in computer science or information technologies. The Computer programmer should have at least one year's experience within the last three years performing electronic data processing computer maintenance programming for a multi-programming computer system and conducting systems analysis design and three years' experience, within the last three years, in computer programming, utilizing Common Business-Oriented Language (COBOL), Basic Assembler Language, or fourth-generation computer languages such as MAPPER, FOCUS, MUMPS and NATURAL for medium-to-large scale third-generation computers, one year of which must have been in electronic data processing computer maintenance programming for a multi-programming computer system and conducting systems analysis.
- (p) Software Technician: The computer software technician should have completed a full 4-year course of study in an accredited college or university leading to a Bachelor's degree or higher in computer science or information technologies and must have 2 years of specialized experience performing the range of duties as described below:
 1. specialized experience including the performance of such tasks as translating detailed logical steps developed by others into language codes that computers accept where this required understanding of procedures and limitations appropriate to use of programming language.
 2. Interviewing subject-matter personnel to get facts regarding work processes, and synthesizing the resulting data into charts showing information flow.
 3. Operating computer consoles where this involved choosing from among various procedures in responding to machine commands or unscheduled halts.
 4. Scheduling the sequence of programs to be processed by computer where alternatives had to be weighed with a view to production efficiency.
 5. Preparing documentation on cost/benefit studies where this involved summarizing the material and organizing it in a logical fashion.
 6. Manipulating data, databases and software for various operating systems and platform applications.
 7. Developing and maintaining web based requirements.

* - Denotes KEY personnel.

SECTION 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE/ CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

The offerors will be evaluated regarding their past performance in the past three (3) years, and corporate experience on related programs in the past five (5) years. Offerors at a minimum should provide a sampling of work accomplished related to On-site engineering and other technical support to Naval, Marine Industry and/or other Government activities. These samples can cover; work samples related to supporting On-site engineering, research and development initiatives and other technical support, investigating single fuel initiatives; supporting detailed design and engineering construction support for HM&E systems on ships/submarines; providing detailed design and engineering construction support for Habitability and Quality of life improvements on various classes of ships.

Offerors can also supply examples related to Live Fire Test and Evaluation (LFT&E) programs, work examples on coding/programming of Autonomic Systems onboard ships, example of providing Electrical system analysis and evaluation on ships, and examples can also be provided related to development of the Recoverability Analysis Tool to analyze proposed ship system designs. The evaluation of this factor may also include verifying the offeror's "references" and obtaining other information outside the proposals concerning the offeror's performance history. Work specifically related to Naval Ships will be more highly rated.

SECTION 4 – MANAGEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

The written proposals should include a thorough management/quality assurance plan for implementing the various tasks. This plan will be evaluated with regard to the sound management and engineering principles employed, quality assurance techniques, the level of detail presented and the amount of tracking or oversight used by the offeror. It should be evident in the proposal that there exists sufficient management to resolve both routine "every day" problems and more complex issues. Written proposals should also evidence the extent to which Small, Small Disadvantaged, Veteran Owned, Service Disabled Veteran Owned, and Women-Owned Businesses, Historically Black Colleges or Universities and Minority Institution Subcontracting such firms are specifically identified in the proposal and subcontracting plan, the extent of commitment to use such firms, the complexity and variety of the work such firms are to perform and the extent of participation of such firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition will be evaluated. Although FAR 52.219-9 does not apply to small businesses, FAR 52.219-8 does apply and small business are required to address this factor.

SECTION 5 - FACILITIES

The written proposals should include adequate information to demonstrate sufficient facilities and infrastructure. Hardware and software capabilities should be sufficient to successfully complete assigned tasks related to the scope of work.

(3) COST PROPOSAL

To assist the Government in determining cost reasonableness/realism for this effort, the offeror shall provide sufficient detailed cost information with the proposal to make this determination. In preparing the cost proposal, it is essential that the offeror breakout and identify separately for each year of the contract, the following types of cost elements listed below. The following is only an example of the various types of cost elements which may be applicable but not necessarily limited to:

Direct Labor Costs:

(1) Information including the name, title, and actual hourly rate shall be provided by the Offeror for each individual proposed for the labor categories identified in Section B. If the Offeror proposes direct labor rates based on a composite rate structure, then the Offeror shall clearly identify the individuals comprising the composite, their respective actual hourly rates, and method used to derive the composite rate.

(2) If an Offeror's proposed labor category differs in name from those listed in Section B, a chart shall be included which identifies how these categories correspond to the ones listed in the solicitation.

(3) The Offeror shall identify any escalation rates utilized in the preparation of their cost proposal, and shall provide historical information pertaining to the actual escalation rate experienced over the past three (3) year period.

(4) Offerors are reminded that the staff proposed in the technical proposal must be the same staff proposed in the cost proposal.

(5) The Offeror shall provide a copy of the Employment Contract for any individual proposed who is not currently employed by the Offeror or subcontractor (if proposed).

Subcontracting Costs: The proposal shall include subcontract cost data in the same level of detail as provided for the offeror. Any subcontracting costs shall be supported. It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure that this support documentation is received by the Government within the timeframe (i.e. closing date) established for this instant solicitation.

Consultants: If applicable, provide a detailed listing of consultants expected to be used, rationale for selection and associated costs which are proposed for reimbursement. Include those items of costs associated with consultants (i.e. hours proposed, and hourly rate). A copy of the Consultant Agreement shall also be provided by the Offeror.

Indirect Rates: Offerors shall list the cost elements that comprise the overhead, general and administrative expenses, and the other indirect pools. All indirect rates shall be summarized. Offerors shall list proposed indirect rates, DCAA recommended rates, and historical actuals (audited and unaudited) for the past three years. If proposed rates reflect negotiated forward pricing rates, a copy of the current forward pricing rate agreement shall be provided. If the rates are not negotiated forward pricing rates, then the basis for the proposed rates shall be explained.

Facilities Capital Cost of Money: If this cost element is proposed, the offeror shall provide information pertaining to the derivation of the FCCOM costs (i.e. FCCOM factors and application bases).

Fee: Identify the fee rate and total amount proposed and identify the various cost elements for which the fee is being applied.

Support Costs: These costs reflect all other direct costs which are not labor costs. For proposal purposes, the not-to-exceed (NTE) amounts for the support costs (material, travel and computer usage) have been identified in Section B. Along with these costs, the Offeror may include a cost element associated with a G&A/handling rate associated with these costs. If a G&A/handling rate is proposed for these support costs, the Offeror shall identify these costs and their applicable rate as provided in Section B. Lastly, It should be noted that all support costs are non-fee bearing costs.

5. The following clause has been modified to change the following:

Changed the number of contracts from three (3), to at least three (3) and no more than five (5) and to increase the word limitation from 300 to 500 words in B-2, PAST PERFORMANCE

Under TECHNICAL FACTORS changed A-2 Project Manager to Project Engineer

Replaced EVALUATION SUB-FACTOR D-1, HARDWARE CAPABILITIES and D-2, SOFTWARE CAPABILITIES

CAR-M03 AGENCY SPECIFIC PROVISION - EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS (AUG 1999) ALTERNATE I (AUG 1999) (NSWCCD)

(a) **General.** Careful, full and impartial consideration will be given to all offers received pursuant to this solicitation, and the evaluation will be applied in a similar manner. Factors against which offers will be evaluated (e.g., Personnel and Cost) are set forth below and parallel the solicitation response called for elsewhere herein.

(b) **Initial Evaluation of Offers.** An evaluation plan has been established to evaluate offers pursuant to the factors set forth in (g) below and all offers received will be evaluated by a team of Government personnel in accordance with the plan. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

(c) **Evaluation Approach.** The following evaluation approach will be used:

(1) *Technical Proposal.* The evaluators will prepare a narrative description and assign a point score for each technical evaluation factor. All evaluation factors other than cost or price will be combined into a merit rating of either outstanding, good, satisfactory, unacceptable, but capable of being upgraded, or unacceptable.

(2) *Cost or Price Proposal.*

(i) Although cost or price is not scored, numerically weighted, or combined with the other evaluation factors to establish a merit rating, it will be evaluated for magnitude and realism. The determination of the magnitude of the cost proposal will be based on the total of all proposed costs. Cost realism is a determination of the probable cost of performance for each offeror. In those evaluations where all other evaluation factors, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price, the degree of importance of the cost or price factor will increase with the degree of equality of the proposals in relation to the other factors on which selection is to be based.

(ii) Proposals which are unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments or unrealistically high or low in cost may be deemed reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence, or indicative of a failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the proposed work, and may be grounds for rejection of the proposal. If the proposed contract requires the delivery of data, the quality of organization and writing reflected in the proposal will be considered to be an indication of the quality of organization and writing which would be prevalent in the proposed deliverable data. Subjective judgment on the part of the Government evaluators is implicit in the entire process. Throughout the evaluation, the Government will consider "correction potential" when a deficiency is identified.

(iii) In evaluating cost type offers, realism of the offeror's estimated cost will be considered. "Realism of Estimated Cost" is determined by reference to the costs which the offeror can reasonably be expected to incur in performance of the contract in accordance with the offer. Unrealistic personnel compensation rates (including issues regarding the applicability of uncompensated overtime) will be considered in the cost realism analysis and may be considered in the technical analysis which could reduce the technical score. The purpose of the evaluation is to: (1) verify the offeror's understanding of the requirements; (2) assess the degree to which the cost proposal reflects the approaches and/or risk that the offeror will provide the supplies or services at the proposed costs; and (3) assess the degree to which the cost included in the cost proposal accurately represents the effort described in the technical proposal. The proposed costs may be adjusted for purposes of evaluation based on the results of the cost realism evaluation. Unrealistic rates will be considered in the risk assessment and may result in a reduced technical score.

(3) *Evaluation of Indirect Rates Applicable to Support Costs:*

(i) The determination of the magnitude of the cost proposal will be based upon adding all proposed costs for CLIN 0001 plus support and subcontract costs. It is intended to reimburse support and subcontract costs on the basis of actual reasonable and allowable costs incurred plus G&A only (no fee). Therefore, for evaluation purposes, the Government will add the offeror's proposed G&A rate to the not-to-exceed (NTE) amounts specified for support and subcontract costs.

(ii) If the offeror's DCAA approved accounting system includes the application on any other indirect cost rates (in addition to G&A) to the support and subcontract cost items, those rates shall be identified in the proposal and will also be added to the respective NTE amount specified for purposes of evaluation. An example would be when the offeror's approved accounting system includes application of a material handling fee to direct material costs and then application of a G&A rate to the subtotal of direct materials plus the material handling fee.

(iii) If an offeror fails to identify, as part of its proposal, an indirect cost rate what would otherwise be applicable to one of the support and subcontract cost items, it shall not be allowed to invoice for the indirect rate after award since the evaluation of its offer did not include that rate.

(iv) Notwithstanding the fact that the Government will add proposed indirect cost rates to the support and subcontract cost NTE amounts specified, it will do so for evaluation purposes only and will not actually change the NTE amount at time of award. Rather, the contract will indicate that the NTE amounts are inclusive of G&A and

whatever other indirect rates the offeror has identified in its proposal, and which were considered in evaluation of that offer.

(v) If proposed indirect rates on support and subcontract costs are not consistent with DCAA information for that offeror, the proposed rates may be adjusted for realism when applied for evaluation purposes.

(d) *Competitive Acquisition Instructions.*

(1) If the provision FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions To Offerors--Competitive Acquisition" is included in Section L of this solicitation, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.

(2) If the provision at FAR 52.215-1 is used with its Alternate I, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract after conducting discussions with offerors whose proposals have been determined to be in the competitive range.

(3) In either of the above two situations, if the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

(e) *Discussion/Final Proposal Revisions.* The Contracting Officer shall indicate to, or discuss with, each offeror still being considered for award, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and other aspects of its proposal (such as cost, price, technical approach, past performance, and terms and conditions) that could, in the opinion of the Contracting Officer, be altered or explained to enhance materially the proposal's potential for award. The scope and extent of discussions are a matter of Contracting Officer judgment. At the conclusion of discussions, each offeror still in the competitive range shall be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal revision. A final cut-off date for receipt of final proposal revisions will be established by the Contracting Officer.

(f) *Basis for Contract Award.* The basis for award of a contract(s) as a result of this solicitation will be an integrated assessment by the Contracting Officer of the results of the evaluation based on the evaluation factors and their importance as indicated below. The integrated assessment may include consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, and, if deemed necessary by the Contracting Officer, consideration of various types of mathematical models comparing technical points and cost. Ultimately, the source selection decision will take into account the offeror's capability to meet the requirements of this solicitation on a timely and cost effective basis. The Government reserves such right of flexibility in conducting the evaluation as is necessary to assure placement of a contract in the Government's best interest. Accordingly, the Government may award any resulting contract to other than the lowest priced offeror, or other than the offeror with the highest evaluation rating.

(1) The contract resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to that responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is determined most advantageous to the Government, cost and other factors considered.

(2) All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

(g) *Evaluation Factors.* The evaluation factors and significant subfactors are listed below in both descending order and degree of relative importance.

1. TECHNICAL FACTORS

A. PERSONNEL

A-1. Program Manager

POINTS

44

08

A-2. Project Engineer	08
A-3. Senior Engineer	07
A-4. Engineer	07
A-5. Systems Analyst	07
A-6. Senior Engineering Technician	07
B. PAST PERFORMANCE/CORPORATE EXPERIENCE	36
B-1. Corporate Experience	26
B-2. Past Performance	10
C. MANAGEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE	12
C-1. Management Ability	06
C-2. Organizational Structure	02
C-3. Quality Assurance Plan	02
C-4. Management of participation by Small and Small Disadvantaged Business	02
D. FACILITIES	08
D-1. Hardware Capabilities	04
D-2. Software Capabilities	04

Factor A is more important than Factor B. Factor B is more important than Factor C. Factor C is more important than Factor D.

2. COST - Cost is currently considered to be one of the least important evaluation factors. The Government reserves the right to increase the relative importance of cost in the event of an equality in the evaluation of the other factors being considered.

EVALUATION OF FACTOR A – PERSONNEL

Factor A, Personnel, will be an evaluation of the proposed personnel based on education, training and experience as described in the required labor categories contained under Section C of the solicitation, **and specific experience directly related to the task statements in the Scope of Work.** Availability of the proposed key personnel will be evaluated. For each labor category, each evaluator will assign an adjectival score between 0% and 100% corresponding to the level of education training and experience of the personnel presented in the resumes. All resumes for a given category will be averaged to come up with a single evaluation score for each labor category. This average will be multiplied by the weight of each sub-factor (labor category) to determine the final score. The Scores and comments will be recorded on Form A. The labor categories are as follows:

Factor A Sub-factors

A-1. Program Manager

A-2 Project Engineer

A-3. Senior Engineer

A-4. Engineer

A-5. Systems Analyst

A-6. Senior Engineering Technician

Sub-factor A-1 and A-2 are equally important. Sub-factors A-3 through A-6 are equally important, but less important than Sub-factors A-1 and A-2.

EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL

The required minimum number of key personnel resumes will be 10. One resume cannot be submitted for more than two (2) labor categories. The offerors shall use the following format for written key personnel resumes:

Labor Category

Name:

Security Clearance:

Current Employer:

Education/Training: (list any diplomas and/or degrees obtained, institution, year obtained)

Summary: (provide a concise summary paragraph on why this individual was selected as key personnel)

Directly Related Work Experience: (list each relevant job title, the inclusive dates of employment (month/yr), the employer, and a brief synopsis for each job listed on how this experience is directly related to the scope of work of the acquisition under competition.)

References: (provide two (2) verifiable references from government or commercial customers with extensive knowledge of the individual on projects of similar size and scope of effort. Names, organization, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses should be provided.)

Signature/Date: (key personnel shall sign and date the resume)

EVALUATION OF FACTOR B – PAST PERFORMANCE/CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

EVALUATION GROUPING

Evaluation Factor B will be based on the offeror's overall corporate experience in providing engineering and technical support in the task areas specified in the Statement of Work Section C, and documented past performance within the past three (3) years. Each sub-factor will be given an adjectival score between 0% and 100%, which will be multiplied by the weight of each sub-factor to determine the final score. Scores and comments will be recorded on Form B, which has two sub-factors listed below.

Factor 2 Sub-factors

B-1. Corporate Experience

B-2. Past Performance

Sub-factor B-1 is the most important. Sub-factor B-2 is less important than Sub-factor B-1.

EVALUATION OF FACTOR B-1, CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

Greatest value will be given to those responses, which demonstrate corporate experience within the last five (5) years with engineering and technical services directly related to the processes, procedures, products and services required in the support of Hull Mechanical and Electrical (HM&E) Programs, specifically on naval vessels and shore establishments. Offerors at a minimum should provide a sampling of work accomplished related to On-site engineering and other technical support to Naval, Marine Industry and/or other Government activities. These samples can cover; work samples related to supporting On-site engineering, research and development initiatives and other technical support, investigating single fuel initiatives; supporting detailed design and engineering construction support for HM&E systems on ships/submarines; providing detailed design and engineering construction support for Habitability and Quality of life improvements on various classes of ships. Offerors can also supply examples related to Live Fire Test and Evaluation (LFT&E) programs, work examples on coding/programming of Autonomic Systems onboard ships, example of providing Electrical system analysis and evaluation on ships, and examples can also be provided related to development of the Recoverability Analysis Tool to analyze proposed ship system designs. The evaluation of this factor may also include verifying the offeror's "references" and obtaining other information outside the proposals concerning the offeror's performance history. Work specifically related to Naval Ships will be more highly rated.

EVALUATION OF FACTOR B-2 , PAST PERFORMANCE

Documented past performance within the past three (3) years will be evaluated. Offerors should provide a list of three (3) and no more than (5) contracts or subcontracts presently active or completed within the past three years for which tasks supported the federal or local government. The following information should be provided for each contract listed: name of contracting activity, contract number, contract type, contract ceiling of labor hours and labor categories, actual number of labor hours tasked/authorized to offeror by labor category, type of work (short description, 500 words or less), contracting officer and phone #, technical government POC and phone #, Program sponsor government POC and phone #, relative past work (explain in 500 words or less how work performed is related to the scope of work). Rating values will be based on how well the contractor performed on contracts listed. Quality of past performance will be determined based on information provided by the offeror including information received by contract POCs, and information gathered from other resources. Greatest value will be given to those responses which demonstrate high quality past performance directly related to the SOW.

EVALUATION OF FACTOR C - MANAGEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN**EVALUATION GROUPING**

Evaluation of Factor C will be based on the offerors demonstration of their ability to provide an adequate organizational structure management plan and quality assurance plan to accomplish the Statement of Work, Section C. Each sub-factor will be given an adjectival score between 0% and 100%, which will be multiplied by the weight of each sub-factor to determine the final score. The scores and comments will be recorded on Form C attached. This factor is broken up into four (4) sub-factors, listed below.

Factor C Sub-factors

C-1. Management Ability

C-2. Organizational Structure

C-3. Quality Assurance Plan

C-4 Management of participation

By Small and Small Disadvantaged

Business

Sub-factor C-1 is most important. Sub-factors C-2 through and C-4 are equally important, but less important than Sub-factor C-1.

EVALUATION SUB-FACTOR C-1, MANAGEMENT ABILITY

The evaluation of this sub-factor is related to the offeror's management ability.

Greatest value will be given to those offerors who demonstrate the capability of managing labor resources, who can effectively control and report cost and performance and who can resolve problems. The offeror should demonstrate the capability to effectively respond to fluctuations in workload, manage separate and overlapping tasks, and add and reduce manpower when required.

EVALUATION SUB-FACTOR C-2, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The evaluation of this sub-factor is related to the offeror's organizational structure for controlling the tasks specified in the Statement of Work, Section C.

Greatest value will be given to those offerors who propose an adequate organization which can coordinate team efforts and assert effective management and cost control and supervision of personnel (including subcontractor, if any) to ensure timeliness and accuracy of deliverables for the varied task areas involved.

EVALUATION SUB-FACTOR C-3, QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

The evaluation of this sub-factor is related to the offeror's Quality Assurance Plan.

Greatest value will be given to those offerors who possess and maintain an effective quality assurance plan. This plan should demonstrate the offeror's capability to document and initiate procedures necessary to accomplish the varied task areas involved.

EVALUATION SUB-FACTOR C-4, MANAGEMENT OF PARTICIPATION BY SMALL AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS

The evaluation of this sub-factor is related to the extent to which offerors identify and commit to small business and to small disadvantaged business, historically black college and university, or minority institution performance of contract, whether as a joint venture, teaming arrangement, or subcontractor.

Criteria for evaluation may include:

- a. The extent to which firms are specifically identified in proposals
- b. The extent of commitment to use such firms
- c. The complexity and variety of the work small firms are to perform
- d. The realism of the proposal
- e. The extent of participation of such firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition.

EVALUATION OF FACTOR D - FACILITIES

EVALUATION GROUPING

Evaluation of Factor D will be based on the offerors demonstration of adequate facilities infrastructure and resources. Each sub-factor will be given an adjectival score between 0% and 100%, which will be multiplied by the weight of each sub-factor to determine the final score. Scores and comments will be recorded on Form D, which has two sub-factors listed below.

Factor D Sub-factors

D-1. Hardware Capabilities

D-2. Software Capabilities

Sub-factors D-1 and D-2 are equally important.

EVALUATION SUB-FACTOR D-1, HARDWARE CAPABILITIES

The evaluation of this sub-factor is related to the offeror's resources and hardware necessary to successfully support the Scope of Work. Access/availability to PCs, Laptops is necessary. Adequate connectivity to Program Manager (e.g. cell phone, PC, email, etc.) will be required.

EVALUATION SUB-FACTOR D-2, SOFTWARE CAPABILITIES

The evaluation of this sub-factor is related to the offeror's software resources necessary to successfully support the Scope of Work. Access/availability of individual email accounts, Internet, MS Office, MS-Project, Photo Management programs, and Windows Operating System is necessary.

6. Offeror's Questions concerning the solicitation are answered as follows:

1. **QUESTION:** In Section L it states that a minimum of 10 resumes are required. There are only six key personnel labor categories. What labor categories do you want the other 4 resumes to come from?

ANSWER: Offerors will be required to submit resumes for key personnel. The required **minimum** number of key personnel resumes will be 10. One resume cannot be submitted for more than two (2) labor categories. The labor categories for the remaining 4 (of the minimum of 10) resumes are at the contractor's discretion.

2. **QUESTION:** SECTION L, SECTION 4 – MANAGEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN (page 63 of the RFP)

Written Proposal should also evidenced the extent to which Small, Small Disadvantaged, Veteran Owned, Service Disabled Veteran Owned, and Woman-Owned Businesses, Historically Black Colleges or Universities and Minority Institutions Subcontracting such firms are specifically identified in the proposal and subcontracting plan, the extent of commitment to use such firms, the complexity and variety of the work such firms are to perform and the extent of participation of such firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition will be evaluated.

Question – FAR 52.219-9 requires the submission and negotiation of a subcontracting plan. The submission of the subcontracting plan IAW with FAR 52.219-9 provides the requirement for contractors to propose subcontracting goals to small businesses, veteran-owned small businesses, service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses, HUBzone small business concerns. Small disadvantaged businesses, and woman-owned small business concerns. Does the above requirement require all contractors to provide additional information above and beyond what is normally required by the submission of a subcontracting plan. The subcontracting plan ,IAW with FAR 52.219-9, requires subcontracting goals, whereby, the above seems to be requiring formal commitments as part of proposal submission. Is it the intent of the above to require that all contractors specifically identify, as part of their proposal, Small, Small Disadvantaged, Veteran Owned, Service Disabled Veteran Owned, and Woman-Owned Businesses, Historically Black Colleges or Universities and Minority Institutions. My questions is, if we adhere to FAR 52.219-9 and provide a subcontracting plan which outlines our subcontracting goals (which are goals and not formal commitments), does this suffice for the above requirement or do all contractors have to identify a subcontractor who qualifies for each category above. If a contractor can not specifically identify subcontractors that will fulfill the small business requirements above, as part of their proposal, are they considered non-responsive? Another questions, can one subcontractor fulfill more than one of the small business requirements?

ANSWER: A Subcontracting Plan will evidence the extent to which Small, Small Disadvantaged, Veteran Owned, Service Disabled Veteran Owned, and Woman-Owned Businesses, Historically Black Colleges or Universities and Minority Institutions are planned to be utilized. If a contractor can not specifically identify subcontractor goals that will fulfill the small business requirements above, as part of their proposal, they will be scored accordingly, but will not be considered non-responsive. One subcontractor cannot fulfill more than one of the small business requirements.

3. **QUESTION:** For pricing purposes, what is the projected award/start date for the contract?

ANSWER: 31 March 2004 is the estimated date of award. This date is not a guarantee, only an estimate.

4. **QUESTION:** In Section M page 69 of 71, Factor B-2 Past Performance, the government has requested the technical point of contact, the contracting officer representative, contracting activity and the program sponsor. What is meant by program sponsor, since the program sponsor is usually the same as the technical point of contact?

ANSWER: The Program Sponsor is someone who is responsible for providing funding to the Technical Point of Contact (TPOC) for the specific projects being tasked.

5. **QUESTION:** On page 61 of 71 Section L, the government has requested a labor category of Engineering Technician (non-key) however on page 3 of 71 the government has not provided any hours in the level of effort. Please clarify.

ANSWER: The Engineering Technician category on page 61 is deleted by this amendment.

6. **QUESTION:** On page 69 of 71 Section M, evaluation factor B-2, Past Performance, the government has requested 3 contracts or subcontracts summaries. The SOW has a large depth and breadth of services, is it the governments intent for us to provide past performance in 300 words to illustrate previous experience that is similar in scope? We feel that 300 words will inadequately provide the government the insight to our capability to provide services that cover the entire SOW. Would the government be willing to increase the number of contracts from three to five?

ANSWER: The solicitation is amended to state "...at least three (3) and no more than five (5) contracts or subcontracts..." and the word limit will be increased to 500 words.

7. **QUESTION:** On page 69 of 71 Section M, evaluation factor B-1, Past Performance, the government has requested both the contract ceiling of labor hours and labor categories, and the actual number of labor hours tasked/authorized to offeror by labor category. You have asked for the labor categories twice, are you interested in the contract labor hour ceiling, or hours by labor category?

ANSWER: The "actual number of labor hours tasked/authorized to offeror by labor category" is all that is required for the actuals of the contracts. We want the labor hour ceiling and labor categories for each contract and then the actual number of labor hours by category tasked/authorized upon completion.

8. **QUESTION:** For the labor category requirements set forth in Section L can years of experience be substituted for educational requirements?

ANSWER: No, years of experience cannot be substituted for education.

9. **QUESTION:** On page 59 of 71 number 2, the RFP makes reference to a technical proposal, however there is no specific section allocated to address the offeror's technical approach to the SOW Section C. Was this an oversight, or is there no technical approach requirement?

ANSWER: No technical approach is required.

10. **QUESTION:** On page 3 of 71 you have 1,355,000 man-hours, would the government give their definition of how many hours are in a man-year?

ANSWER: One man-year equals 2080 hours

11. **QUESTION:** On page 3 of 71 if a man-year is defined as 2080, then the program manager labor category is comprised of 10.10 personnel. Are we to assume the government would like to see 10 program managers?

ANSWER: Page 3 is used for estimating purposes only. See answer to Question number 1 concerning resume submittals.

12. **QUESTION:** On page 60 of 71, Section 2 the government has requested that a minimum of 10 resumes be provided for key labor categories, with only 6 key labor categories defined. Are we to assume the government would like us to provide multiple resumes in some key categories. If so, in which labor categories do you want more than one resume?

ANSWER: See answer to Question number 1 concerning resume submittals.

13. **QUESTION:** Section L does not give a page count for the technical proposal, is this correct?

ANSWER: The solicitation is amended to require a maximum of 100 pages for the technical proposal.

14. **QUESTION:** Page 60 of 71, Section 2 there is no page limitation on resumes, is this correct?

ANSWER: The solicitation is amended to require a maximum of 3 pages for key personnel resumes.

15. **QUESTION:** On page 63 of 71, Section 5 there is no mention of a specific mile radius or traveling distance required to support NSWC CD Code 93, is this correct?

ANSWER: This contract will support the entire Carderock Division, not Code 93 exclusively. There is no mile radius or traveling distance support requirement.

16. **QUESTION:** There is no mention of a percentage of time that the government foresees for on-site contractor support, is this correct?

ANSWER: The Labor Hour estimates are revised to reflect an estimate of work that may be performed at Government office facilities verses the contractor's site.

17. **QUESTION:** There are no evaluation factors in Section M for the contractor's technical approach to accomplish the SOW areas 2.1 a-v.

ANSWER: No technical approach is required.

18. **QUESTION:** In Section L of the RFP, under Past Performance, the Government asks for a "Sampling of Work". Do you want the contractor to provide a sample product in the form of a detailed description (narrative) or does the Government want the actual document(s) that were submitted to the Government as technical products? The actual sample products are large and will require many boxes. It would be better if detailed narrative of the sample products could be submitted.

ANSWER: A detailed description (narrative) sampling of work is required. No actual work samples are to be provided.

19. **QUESTION:** Section 4 - Management/ Quality Assurance Plan, RFP page 63 indicates "Written proposals should also evidence the extent to which Small, Small Disadvantaged, Veteran Owned, Service Disabled Veteran Owned and Women Owned, Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Institution subcontracting such firms are specifically identified in the proposal and subcontracting plan, the extent of commitment to such firms, the complexity and variety of the acquisition will be evaluated". Although FAR 52.219-9 asks for only "Goals, expressed in terms of percentage of total planned subcontracting dollars, for use of small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business, and historically black colleges and Universities". The FAR only asks for goals expressed in terms of total dollars planned for subcontracting and does not ask to specifically identify firms by name for inclusion into the proposal. Can we assume the Government will accept a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 that does not name specific disadvantaged companies/Universities by name?

ANSWER: Same answer as Question number 2. Firms do not need to be identified by name in the subcontracting plan.

20. **QUESTION:** Can years of experience be substituted for a college education?

ANSWER: No, years of experience cannot be used as a substitution.

21. **QUESTION:** On page 67 of the RFP there is reference to a "single fuel initiative". Can you provide a clarification or definition of this term?

ANSWER: The U.S. Navy is conducting a feasibility study of converting to JP-5, MIL-DTL-5624, NATO F-44, as the single naval fuel at sea. The naval single battlefield fuel would be used in all aircraft propulsion, ship propulsion, electric power generation systems, and USMC ground force equipment.

22. **QUESTION:** (Page 3) Please verify that all hours shall be proposed as contractor site effort.

ANSWER: The Labor Hour estimates are revised to reflect an estimate of work that may be performed at Government office facilities verses the contractor's site.

23. **QUESTION:** (Page 4) Can the government provide an estimated start date for performance?

ANSWER: It is anticipated that award will be 31 March 2004. This is only an estimate.

24. **QUESTION:** (Page 61) Engineering Technician position is described but no hours identified on page 3.

ANSWER: The Engineering Technician position is deleted by this amendment.

25. **QUESTION:** (Page 63) Please clarify references to Sections C.4 & C.7 in (3)(1) & (3)(2).

ANSWER: The references are changed to Section B in this amendment.

26. **QUESTION:** (Page 67) Please verify that reference to Project Manager should be Project Engineer.

ANSWER: The reference for A-2 is changed to Project Engineer in this amendment.

27. **QUESTION:** (Page 3, Level of Effort) Year I, Logistician list 14,00, should this be 14,000 like the base year and year II-IV?

ANSWER: The Level of Effort has been changed in this amendment, see revised chart.

28. **QUESTION:** (Page 60, Section 1) Second sentence, "The factors detailed below will be evaluated by the EC", please define the "EC" and will this be made available?

ANSWER: EC stand for Evaluation Committee. It will not be made available.

29. **QUESTION:** (Page 61, para (k)) Paragraph list a "Engineering Technician", yet there are no hours assigned to this labor category in the table found on page 3 of this RFP, Level of Effort. Will hours be assigned to this labor category or will the labor category be deleted from this solicitation?

ANSWER: Engineering Technician category is deleted by this amendment.

30. **QUESTION:** (Page 62, para (o)) The programming languages listed for this labor category are not common tools used in today's programming fields, "Common Business-Oriented Language (COBOL), Basic Assembler Language, or fourth-generation computer languages such as MAPPER, FOCUS, MUMPS and NATURAL for medium-to-large scale thirdgeneration computers". Are these programs from legacy systems that currently have these languages in use and will the Computer programmer be required to program with these languages? Should programmers be offered with skills other than these languages?

ANSWER: Please elaborate, unable to respond. Unsure of question.

31. **QUESTION:** (Page 63, Cost Proposal (3)(1)) States “Information including the name, title, and actual hourly rate shall be provided by the Offeror for each individual proposed for the labor categories identified in Sections C.4 and C.7” Unable to locate sections C.4 and C.7 in the solicitation. Please provide location to C.4 and C.7.

ANSWER: Section reference is changed to Section B in this amendment.

32. **QUESTION:** (Page 63, Cost Proposal (3)(2)) States “If an Offeror's proposed labor category differs in name from those listed in Section C.7” Unable to locate section C.7 in the solicitation. Please provide location to C.7.

ANSWER: Section reference is changed to Section B in this amendment.

33. **QUESTION:** (Page 63, Cost Proposal (3)(4)) States, “Offerors are reminded that the staff proposed in the technical proposal must be the same staff proposed in the cost proposal.” Sections M and L indicate that the minimum number of resumes to be submitted is 10. There are over 60 man-years of key labor hours requested. There is no requirement in the technical proposal to submit a complete staffing plan, by employee name covering all key labor category man-hours. Does the government want a table in the technical proposal that identifies the complete key labor category technical staff that will correspond with the names listed in the cost proposal or does a sampling of resumes for these categories suffice?

ANSWER: See answer to Question number 1. A table is not required.

34. **QUESTION:** (Page 62, Section L) PAST PERFORMANCE/CORPORATE EXPERIENCE, in the middle of the paragraph, a sentence begins “These samples can cover...” Does the government desire bidders to submit actual samples of work completed (Drawing, feasibility studies, ECPs, etc.), or is a concise written description of the project, including the types of deliverables generated, sufficient?

ANSWER: Concise written description of project is acceptable.

35. **QUESTION:** (Page 71, Section M) EVALUTION SUB-FACTOR D-2, SOFTWARE CAPABILITIES, the paragraph concludes “Evidence of individual email accounts, Internet, NAVSEA Phila Web-Site, MS Office, MS-Project, PhotoManagement programs, and Windows Operating System”. This is not a complete sentence. Does the government want the offerer to provide evidence of these items, and if so what constitutes evidence?

ANSWER: These factors are revised in this amendment.

36. **QUESTION:** On page 62 of 71 Section L, as well as page 69 of 71 Section M, the government has indicated that samples can cover investigating single fuel initiatives. Will the government please define single fuel initiatives? Are single fuel initiatives a program that is currently being provided by a contractor at NSWCD? And if so who is the contractor?

ANSWER: The U.S. Navy is conducting a feasibility study of converting to JP-5, MIL-DTL-5624, NATO F-44, as the single naval fuel at sea. This naval single battlefield fuel would be used in all aircraft propulsion, ship propulsion, electric power generation systems, and USMC ground force equipment. There is currently no present initiative underway at NSWCCD.

37. **QUESTION:** Modification 03 indicated that at least one award would be made to small business provided they are technically acceptable and competitive pricing is obtained. The solicitation indicated that multiple awards may be made but did not address the small business issue. Please confirm that the intention of Modification 03 still applies.

ANSWER: No special consideration will be offered to small businesses. If a small business is technically acceptable and competitive pricing is obtained they may receive an award.

38. **QUESTION:** P.60 - Section 2 - Personnel - states that a minimum of 10 key personnel resumes are required. There are 6 key personnel labor categories. Is there a specific requirement for the distribution of the 10 minimum resumes among the 6 key categories or is that to be determined by the offeror?

ANSWER: See answer to Question number 1.

39. **QUESTION:** P. 61 - Engineer - has a requirement for "Experience in mathematical modeling of, or trend performance of shipboard equipment or systems". This is also a requirement for the Systems Analyst. This seems an appropriate requirement for the Systems Analyst but not for the Engineer. Request that this requirement be deleted for the Engineer (and Junior Engineer).

ANSWER: The requirement is necessary and will not be removed.

40. **QUESTION:** P. 67 - 1. Technical Factors - A. Personnel - Is A-2 Project Manager the same as the Project Engineer list on p. 60 and p. 3?

ANSWER: The reference for A-2 is changed to Project Engineer in this amendment.

41. **QUESTION:** The RFP does not reference NSWCCD Code 93 as a client, even though the three current incumbent contractors provide support to mainly Code 93 under this contract. Are we to assume that the evaluators will not be evaluated on Code 93 requirements, but any and all NSWCCD wide HM&E requirements. The SOW is very broad and Code 93 does not require most of the services stated therein. Please explain.

ANSWER: The solicitation is for work to be performed throughout the Carderock Division and will be evaluated accordingly. The three incumbent contractors provide services to everyone within the Division and NAVSEA. There is no mention of it being specifically a Code 93 contract.

42. **QUESTION:** Reference: a) Solicitation page 58, Section L (e) and b) Solicitation page 64, Section L (3), Support Costs.

Please confirm that contractor support costs such as computer usage and reproduction costs are included in the government stipulated amounts for support costs provided in Solicitation Section B and additional costs associated with these direct costs should not be added to the contractors proposal.

ANSWER: This is confirmed.

43. **QUESTION:** Reference: a) Solicitation page 64, Section L (3), Support Costs and b) Solicitation page 66, Section M(3).

Please confirm that the contractor should not apply indirect rates to the government stipulated support costs provided in Solicitation Section B and include as an additional cost in their proposal. The contractor should identify what those indirect rates are but the government will add them for evaluation purposes only.

ANSWER: The above is confirmed.